

## ***Appendix A: Assessment Summaries***

Mac Arthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 10: Community Violence (DRAFT) .....	2
The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: A Report and Recommendations regarding a Report Card on Oakland’s Liquor Stores (City of Oakland Staff Report).....	5
Macarthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 4: Retail Services (DRAFT) .....	8
Neighborhood Knowledge for Change .....	11
Tapping the Potential of Urban Roof tops Rooftop Resources Neighborhood Assessment.....	14
Groundwork Oakland Feasibility Study and Strategic Plan .....	17
23rd Avenue Community Action Plan .....	23
Oak to Ninth Avenue Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 3: Parks and Natural Spaces (DRAFT) .....	27
The East Bay Greenway Health Impact Assessment .....	31
Mac Arthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 3: Transportation (DRAFT) .....	36
West Oakland Community-Based Transportation Plan .....	40
Central and East Oakland Community-Based Transportation Plan.....	43
Roadblocks to Health: Transportation Barriers to Health Communities.....	47
Mac Arthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 11: Social Cohesion and Social Exclusion (DRAFT).....	50
Mac Arthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 5: Schools and Child Care (DRAFT) .....	53

**Mac Arthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 10: Community Violence (DRAFT)**

<b>Year Completed:</b>	2007
<b>Study Category:</b>	Crime
<b>Produced By:</b>	UC Berkeley Health Impact Group
<b>Author(s):</b>	Suzanne Tsang
<b>Client/Reader:</b>	City decision-makers, City planning staff, Community organizations, Developers
<b>Geography:</b>	Mac Arthur BART Transit Village (MBTV) and surrounding neighborhood. Though the actual project is located east of the I-580 corridor, since the station is adjacent to neighborhoods west of I-580, these neighborhoods will be affected by impacted by design decisions for the MRTV.
<b>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</b>	This health impact assessment (HIA) identifies factors that contribute to a healthier, safer environment for the redevelopment of the Mac Arthur BART station area.
<b>Key Stakeholders:</b>	Community Members, Developers
<b>Methodology:</b>	Health Impact Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Map baseline crime rates in area</li><li>▪ Identify physical design strategies for crime prevention.</li></ul>
<b>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</b>	INDICATORS and VARIABLES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Property crime</li><li>▪ Violent crime</li><li>▪ Retail and residential activity</li><li>▪ Social capital/Social cohesion</li><li>▪ Housing</li><li>▪ Transportation</li><li>▪ Product availability</li><li>▪ Aesthetic/ambiance</li><li>▪ Liquor stores</li></ul> FACTORS <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Risk factors are traits or characteristics that increase the relative risk of an individual or community being affected by or perpetrating violence. Risk factors for community violence include: poverty and economic disparity, illiteracy and school failure, alcohol and other drugs, firearms, negative family dynamics, mental illness, incarceration/reentry, community deterioration, discrimination and oppression, power and control, media violence, experiencing and witnessing violence, and, gender socialization.</li></ul>

- Resiliency factors are traits or characteristics that protect an individual or community from violence. Resiliency factors from violence include: economic capital, meaningful opportunities for participation, positive attachments and relationships, good physical and mental health, social capital, built environment, services and institutions, emotional and cognitive competence, artistic and creative opportunities, ethnic, racial, and inter-group relations, and media/marketing.
- As stated in the *Alameda County Blueprint for Violence Prevention*, violence prevention efforts targeted toward young children work to prevent experiencing or witnessing violence when young as well as to reduce the risk of future perpetration or victimization of violence.
- Built environment elements that promote violence prevention include, “housing, transportation, product availability, and aesthetic/ambiance. Poor and inadequate housing is associated with increased risk for violence and psychological stress.
- Decisions about housing and its design can promote social interaction, community stability, and build a solid tax base to fund needed services, including violence prevention.
- Reliable and affordable transportation can ensure that people have access to jobs and services.
- Zoning can also influence the availability of beneficial products such as books and school supplies, sports equipment, arts and crafts supplies, and other recreational items as well as limit availability or lack, of potentially harmful products such as tobacco, firearms, alcohol, and other drugs can also have an impact on violence within a community.
- Low-income communities and communities of color have greater access to alcohol and tobacco products due to the high prevalence of local liquor stores.”
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) strategies:
  - Physical design and immediate situational factors of a place may encourage or inhibit violence.
  - Physical design and immediate situational factors can create a sense of territoriality in the legitimate users of a space and induce them to act on that attachment in order to protect against violence and other illegitimate use.
  - Modifications can be made to the environment to reduce opportunities for violence by making the commission of the violent event appear more risky, more difficult, less rewarding, and less excusable to the potential offender.
  - The effectiveness of specific environmental modifications to reduce violence depends on the type of violence and the particular setting (place, context) in which it occurs.
  - Though environmental modifications alone will not prevent all violence in all settings, they offer a promising prevention and control strategy.

- CPTED principles include: natural surveillance, natural access control, and territorial reinforcement, maintenance, and activity support. Natural surveillance limits the opportunity for crime by placing physical features, activities, and people in such a way to maximize visibility of a property or building. Natural access control creates a perception of risk in selecting crime targets by placing entrances and exits, fencing, lighting, and landscape to limit access or control flow. Territorial reinforcement employs such design elements as sidewalks, landscaping, and porches to help distinguish between public and private areas and helps users exhibit signs of “ownership” that send “hands off” messages to would-be offenders. The care and maintenance of property allows for the continued use of a space for its intended purpose; deterioration and blight indicates less control by the intended users of a site and indicate a greater tolerance of disorder. Activity support increases the use of a built environment for safe activities with the intent of increasing the risk of detection of criminal and undesirable activities.

***Findings:***

- In 2004, the property crime rate in Oakland was about 5,500 per 100,000 residents and the violent crime rate was 1277 per 100,000 residents.
- Oakland thus ranks 3rd in violent crime rate among California cities with populations of 100,000 and above.
- Between 1998 and 2000, rates for assault hospitalizations were higher in Oakland than at the county level for each race/ethnic group.
- Homicide rates in Oakland were also consistently been higher than the county between 1990 and 2001.
- Rates of property crimes, which include burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft, have declined significantly between 1985 and 2001 in Oakland.
- Property crime rates rose to just over 11,000 per 100,000 residents in 1989 and fell steadily to about 5,500 in 2001.

***Recommendations:***

- Provide adequate and pedestrian scaled lighting for all public areas, residential streets, and adjacent public streets.
- Create clear sight lines to maximize visibility, especially for high risk areas such as parking garages, stairwells and underpasses.
- Create public or common spaces that generate/reinforce a lot of pedestrian level activity and/or encourage a sense of community. For example, community urban gardens provide a setting for social activity and users of the gardens contribute to surveillance.
- Use durable, vandal resistant materials so maintenance is minimal.

***The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: A Report and Recommendations regarding a Report Card on Oakland's Liquor Stores (City of Oakland Staff Report)***

<b><i>Year Completed:</i></b>	2004
<b><i>Study Category:</i></b>	Crime
<b><i>Produced By:</i></b>	City of Oakland
<b><i>Author(s):</i></b>	Alexander Nguyen, Director of Neighborhood Law Corps, City of Oakland Attorney's Office
<b><i>Client/Reader:</i></b>	City Council, Community Members
<b><i>Geography:</i></b>	Oakland
<b><i>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</i></b>	This is a "Report Card" that assesses the City-wide impact of liquor stores in Oakland.
<b><i>Key Stakeholders:</i></b>	City Legislators, City Staff, Community Members
<b><i>Methodology:</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Location and number of liquor stores mapped</li><li>▪ Assesses areas of over-concentration as defined by state and areas of high crime as defined by state</li> <li>▪ This Report Card will give the City and community a benchmark for assessing the impact of liquor stores in Oakland, help us to identify all problem neighborhoods, set goals for working with ABC in high crime and over-concentrated areas, and provide the Planning Commission with a fuller picture as it evaluates liquor store Conditional Use Permit applications, Deemed Approved Status Appeals, and Public Necessity or Convenience findings.</li></ul>
<b><i>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</i></b>	<p>INDICATORS and VARIABLES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Number of liquor stores</li><li>▪ Crime</li><li>▪ Safety</li><li>▪ Excessive litter</li><li>▪ Graffiti</li><li>▪ Serious violations, e.g. selling alcohol to minors, selling drug paraphernalia</li></ul> <p>FACTORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Last year, Neighborhood Law Corps worked with community members and store owners to implement a voluntary good neighbor program. More than 100 store owners signed a pledge to: 1) close at midnight, two hours earlier than state law allows for liquor sales; 2) stop the sale of fortified wines; 3) stop the sale of drug paraphernalia; and 4) participate in neighborhood</li></ul>

meetings. They expected at least a 50% success rate with the voluntary good-neighbor program. According to Oakland's Alcohol Beverage Action Team, there has been a 58% success rate.

- When an operator applies for a new liquor license at ABC, two important conditions impact the CA Department of Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) review for "undue concentration." One is whether the applicant will be in an area of high crime as determined from annual crime statistics, and the second is whether the location under consideration has surpassed its concentration limit of liquor outlets as determined by census tract population.
- In February of 2000, City Council passed resolution 75490 "adopting a city goal to see no net increase in certain retail alcoholic beverage sales licenses except within identified areas"
- In 1999, City Council adopted resolution 75409, "adopting the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) concept and principles, and implementing a CPTED pilot project in the uptown area."
- Lack of visibility through windows of liquor stores remains a problem. While state law regulates that no more than 33% of a liquor store's window area may be covered with signs or advertising, the law likely does not prevent store owners from blocking window visibility with other barriers, such as refrigerators or shelves. Some stores, while complying with the state's 33% signage law, block the remaining 67% of their windows with other barriers.

***Findings:***

- Neighborhood Law Corps Attorneys have attended over 200 community meetings. The single most consistent priority from neighborhood to neighborhood was problem liquor stores.
- Community complaints about these stores range from excess litter and loitering to accusations of alcohol sales to minors, drug dealing, prostitution, and shootings.
- Neighborhood Law Corps Attorneys found that while many neighborhoods were focused on trying to abate local problem liquor stores, there has not been a comprehensive analysis of the impact liquor stores have city-wide.
- Oakland has neighborhoods with more liquor stores than the State limit would allow if we were starting with a new city today that had no liquor stores.
- In the City of Oakland, there are over 900 liquor licenses – over 900 commercial sources for alcohol. Of these, 359 are classified for off-sales (sale of alcohol to take off premise)
- Under State "undue concentration" guidelines, Oakland currently has 16 police beats that are 'high crime,' and 29 areas of 'over-concentration' of liquor stores.
- Of the 57 police beats in Oakland, 16 beats are designated as high crime areas by ABC.
- Of the seven districts in Oakland, six exceed ABC's liquor license concentration limit. The extreme case is district 3, which is over by 28.

***Recommendations:***

- It is recommended that City Council support a policy of vigorous enforcement of the Deemed Approved Ordinance whereby the City of Oakland shows it will not tolerate serious violations or repeated lesser violations of the Deemed Approved Ordinance. To be effective, this would

- entail prompt attention every time a violation occurs.
- It is recommended that Council enact a new Attrition Moratorium stating that Oakland will have no new liquor stores or licenses.
  - It is recommended that Council direct Planning and City Attorney staff to research the possibility of regulating windows to provide visibility for public safety.
  - Staff recommends that Council implement the 30-day public input period to complete the Report Card, support a policy of vigorous enforcement of the Deemed-Approved Ordinance, enact a new Attrition Moratorium for liquor licenses in Oakland, and pursue regulations that ensure visibility into liquor stores.

**Macarthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 4: Retail Services (DRAFT)**

<b>Year Completed:</b>	2007
<b>Study Category:</b>	Land Use
<b>Produced By:</b>	UC Berkeley Health Impact Group
<b>Author(s):</b>	Mary Lee
<b>Client/Reader:</b>	City decision-makers, City planning staff, Community organizations, Developers
<b>Geography:</b>	Mac Arthur BART Transit Village (MBTV) and surrounding neighborhood. Though the actual project is located east of the I-580 corridor, since the station is adjacent to neighborhoods west of I-580, these neighborhoods will be affected by impacted by design decisions for the MBTV.
<b>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</b>	This health impact assessment (HIA) identifies factors that contribute to a healthier, safer environment for the redevelopment of the Mac Arthur BART station area.
<b>Key Stakeholders:</b>	Community Members, Developers
<b>Methodology:</b>	Health Impact Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Data profiles the relative prevalence of nutrition related illness in the project area.</li><li>▪ Map area retail food resources</li><li>▪ Map existing retail establishments</li><li>▪ Assess area retail needs via maps and area interviews</li><li>▪ Research feasible interventions to improve area retail environment</li><li>▪ Review LSA retail study when complete</li><li>▪ Survey local business owners</li></ul>
<b>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</b>	INDICATORS and VARIABLES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Employment</li><li>▪ Community economic investment</li><li>▪ Access to essential goods and services</li><li>▪ Nutritional health</li><li>▪ Physical activity</li><li>▪ Social cohesion</li><li>▪ Environmental quality</li><li>▪ Retail diversity</li><li>▪ Non-work-related trips</li><li>▪ Transit modes</li><li>▪ Premature mortality</li><li>▪ Chronic disease</li><li>▪ Obesity</li></ul>

- Hypertension
- Psychological well-being
- Density
- Street connectivity
- Development diversity and density (mixed use)
- Economic development polices (indicator of health disparities)
- Self sufficiency wages
- Community violence/crime
- Liquor store density
- Locally owned businesses
- Unemployment rate
- Access to business loans
- Access to business insurance
- Presence of local police
- Access to marketing agents
- Food stamp program enrollment
- Farmers markets
- Hospitalization rates
- Access to quality food

#### FACTORS

Outstanding challenges for the planning of the MBTV are (1) to ensure new retail meets area resident needs and (2) to protect the livelihoods and enhance the success of existing merchants and residents.

#### **Findings:**

Based on current planning and design proposals, the Macarthur BART Transit Village is likely to have the following effects on individual and community health:

1. A retail plan that includes a neighborhood grocery store is likely to improve access to quality food and nutritional health for both residents and BART commuters. This benefit will depend on the size, diversity, and affordability of the establishment and may be greatest for a full service grocery store. (Potential Beneficial Effect)
2. Development of a vibrant mixed-use commercial corridor through residential and retail development has potential to deter crime, reducing injuries and stress for residents. (Potential Beneficial Effect)
3. The transit village may contribute to the diversity of retail goods and services to the neighborhood. Via effects on pedestrian activity the project may increase resident physical activity and reduce some vehicle trips. Ensuring that new retail fills existing gaps and responds to resident needs will maximize this benefit. (Potential Beneficial Impact)
4. New retail associated with the project may provide new employment opportunities some of which may be suitable for unemployed or underemployed area residents. Job training and local recruitment may support this benefit. (Potential Beneficial Impact)
5. The project will increase retail property value and as a result, may eventually displace some of the current retail businesses, disrupting local livelihoods. (Potential Adverse Effect)

#### **Recommendations:**

1. Ensure retail development is reflective of community's wants and needs

- a. Conduct a comprehensive retail market analysis to include a retailer and consumer survey
  - b. Establish a neighborhood retail planning council to assist in retail planning phases
- 2. Create a local fund via a development agreement or assess a development impact fees to:
  - a. maintain property affordability for current vulnerable businesses
- 3. Encourage a wide variety of healthy food establishments
  - a. Recruit a full-service grocery store to occupy retail space on the site;
  - b. Alternatively, work to locate a full service grocery store on the western side of SR 24.
  - c. Hold a farmers market near western side of the BART station
  - d. Require retail food stores to accept food stamps and EBT.
- 4. Ensure that community members have adequate and equitable access to a range of necessary, yet diverse array of goods and services.
  - a. Recruit a pharmacy, bank, and hardware store to locate at or near the site
  - b. Require retail food stores to accept food stamps and EBT.
- 5. Provide tax incentives, or interest-free loans to stimulate local entrepreneurship
  - a. Provide incentives for full-service grocery store – (e.g., help pay for parking spaces)
- 6. Use a development agreement or a community benefits agreement to ensure:
  - a. employment of local residents in new retail
  - b. provision of jobs with living wage and health insurance
  - c. fund workforce development programs
- 7. Analyze the current labor market in terms of employment opportunities, placement, and retention and implement appropriate retail development according to workforce needs.
- 8. Prohibit or limit retail establishments associated with adverse health outcomes such a liquor stores
- 9. Work with the community to create strategies promoting safety, reducing crime, and elevating perceived safety among retailers and consumers.

## ***Neighborhood Knowledge for Change***

***Year Completed:*** 2002

***Study Category:*** Neighborhood Quality

***Produced By:*** Pacific Institute

***Author(s):*** Steve Costa, Meean Palaniappan, Arlene Wong

***Client/Reader:*** Community members, City Staff, Foundations

***Geography:*** West Oakland

***Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative*** This report documents a community-driven process where residents selected the neighborhood indicators they wanted to track. The authors collected, analyzed, and reported on the selected indicators to support the continuing use of this data to advocate for health, safety, and neighborhood vitality in West Oakland.

***Key Stakeholders:*** West Oakland community members

***Methodology:*** The project was designed to support a community driven process. The West Oakland (Environmental Indicators Project (EIP) established a Taskforce of neighborhood residents who served as the community center/conscience of the project. Over the course of seven meetings, participants sought to define the term “environment” in the context of West Oakland; identify environmental issues in the community; select what indicators community members would want to measure and track; and determine how such information can be incorporated into current advocacy, policy, education, and organizing work. The Neighborhood Taskforce had agreed on a core set of indicators. After the indicators were selected, Pacific Institute’s team of researchers collected and analyzed data from city, county, state, and national agencies and compiled the information in the 17 indicator reports that make up the bulk of this report.

***Indicators, Variables, Factors:*** INDICATORS and VARIABLES

- Air Pollution
- Air Pollution Health Risks
- Asthma Rates
- Voting Power
- Vulnerability to Displacement/Housing Affordability
- Community Stability/Market Trends
- Subsidized Housing Supply
- New Business Development
- Illegal Dumping
- Land Use Conflict
- Neighborhood Toxic Volumes
- Resident Toxic Exposure

- Sensitive Area Toxic Hazard Exposure
- Lead Poisoning
- Lead Abatement
- Transit Mobility
- Bikeable Streets

FACTORS

n/a

**Findings:**

***Air Pollution***

In 1998, West Oakland zip code 94607 registered 34,103 pounds of toxic air releases by TRI permitted facilities, the highest of any Oakland neighborhood and nearly half of the total Oakland air releases.

***Air Pollution Health Risks***

West Oakland residents had the second highest health risk from air pollution in the city of Oakland in 1997.

***Asthma Rates***

In 1998, West Oakland children were seven times more likely to be hospitalized for asthma than the average child in the state of California.

***Voting Power***

Less than half of the registered voters in West Oakland voted in the last Presidential election; this is over 15% lower than the voting rate in District 3, and over 20% lower than in the city of Oakland as a whole.

***Vulnerability to Displacement & Housing Affordability***

In 1999, only 35% of West Oakland residents could afford to buy the median priced home in the neighborhood, and only 31% could afford the median rent on available housing units.

***Community Stability & Market Trends***

Out of the 1,276 West Oakland parcels that were sold from January 1997 to June 1999, nearly a quarter of them (23.6%) were being sold for the second time within two years.

***Subsidized Housing Supply***

While West Oakland is considered saturated in the number of publicly assisted housing units in the neighborhood (over 20% of all public housing in Oakland is located in West Oakland); there has been a decline in the number of private units renting to HUD Section 8 voucher holders.

***New Business Development***

The last few years has seen a steady increase in new business development in West Oakland, most notably in the retail, services, and advanced services (e.g., computer software, consulting, architecture) sectors.

***Illegal Dumping***

Between January and June 2000, the City of Oakland removed 263 tons of illegally dumped garbage from the streets of West Oakland; per capita, this was three times the amount collected in the rest of city.

***Land Use Conflict***

Nearly 82% of West Oakland residents live within 1/8 mile of an industrial area.

***Neighborhood Toxic Volumes***

In 1998, West Oakland generated five times more toxic chemicals per per capita than the city of Oakland.

***Resident Toxic Exposure***

The overwhelming majority of West Oakland residents (83%) live in close proximity to at least one of the 403 contaminated or potentially contaminated sites in the neighborhood; this is significantly higher than resident toxic exposure in the rest of Oakland (54%).

***Sensitive Area Toxic Hazard Exposure***

Over 10% of the sensitive sites (schools, hospitals, etc.) in West Oakland are within 1/8 mile of a Priority 1 High Hazardous Facility. In the rest of Oakland, only 2% of sensitive sites face this level of risk.

***Lead Poisoning***

Since 1995, the West Oakland zip code of 94607 has ranked as one of the top three worst zip codes for childhood lead poisoning risk within the entire Alameda County.

***Lead Abatement***

Although West Oakland is considered one of the highest risk areas in Alameda County for lead poisoning, the number of lead abatement projects in West Oakland in 2000 was less than 8% of the total for Oakland.

***Transit Access & Service***

From 1995 to 1999, the West Oakland neighborhood experienced a 15% reduction in the frequency and range of bus service.

***Bikeable Streets***

West Oakland currently has only 0.95 miles of designated bikeways, although Oakland's Bicycle Master Plan has proposed adding 10 miles of new bikeways.

***Recommendations:***

This is an informational report. Thus, rather than providing recommendations, the authors provide information on how local residents can learn more about the findings of each indicator and get involved to mitigate the problems.

***Tapping the Potential of Urban Roof tops Rooftop Resources Neighborhood Assessment***

***Year Completed:*** 2007

***Study Category:*** Parks and Open Space

***Produced By:*** Bay Localize  
436 14th Street, Ste 1127  
Oakland, CA 94612  
510-834-0420  
www.baylocalize.org

***Author(s):*** It was prepared by Brian Holland and Sarah Sutton of Design, Community and Environment, Kate Stillwell of Holmes Culley, and Ingrid Severson and Kirsten Schwind of Bay Localize.

***Client/Reader:*** N/A

***Geography:*** Eastlake neighborhood in Oakland:

- Comprising roughly one-quarter of a square mile, the Study Area consists of the Eastlake commercial district and surrounding residential neighborhoods southeast of Lake Merritt in Oakland.
- The area provides a fertile testing ground for rooftop resource feasibility due to its great diversity, both in its socioeconomic conditions and its built environment.

***Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative***

- Increasing access to green space and urban gardening opportunities

***Key Stakeholders:***

***Methodology:*** This assessment analyzes the potential for green roofs, rooftop gardens, solar photovoltaics, and rainwater harvesting on existing buildings and future developments, and identifies possible benefits to the Eastlake neighborhood in

Oakland. A model was developed for this study to produce quantitative estimates of rooftop productivity.

- Buildings in the Study Area were categorized into types to generalize their characteristics, including the weight-bearing capacity of the roof structure.
- Rooftop resource prototypes were then designed to serve as test retrofits, providing data on loading characteristics. The prototypes were tailored to meet the special needs of existing buildings and were correlated with productivity estimates per square foot.
- Prototypes were then assigned to each building based on their suitability. Vacant lots were categorized as “opportunity sites” that could hold intensive, edible roof gardens.
- Finally, the total area and productivity estimates of each prototype were used to determine aggregate benefits to the Eastlake Study Area.

### ***Prototype Assignment***

Each building in the Study Area is assigned one or more rooftop resource prototypes. The following criteria are incorporated into the assignment process:

- Prototype Load and Roof Loading Capacity. Loading is a primary consideration in matching prototypes with suitable buildings.
- Roof Access and Building Code Access Requirements. Access is another primary consideration in the assignment.
- Occupancy Type. In some cases, more than one prototype would meet the above primary criteria for a building. Occupancy type is a secondary criterion that allows for consideration of what prototype the building occupant would more likely choose based on its costs and benefits.

### ***Existing Conditions Analysis***

Existing conditions were documented through a combination of aerial photograph analysis and a field survey of the study area.

- A GIS (Geographic Information Systems) base map of building “roofprints” was created based on the aerial photograph and information about roof slope and existing rooftop resources was obtained from the photograph.
- A field survey was conducted by volunteers to document building types and construction characteristics. The volunteers were trained in simple techniques for identifying building characteristics and ten groups were each assigned a portion of the study area to walk and analyze. Collected information was entered into the GIS database and correlated with estimates of roof loading capacity.

### ***Estimating Roof Loading Capacity***

#### ***Productivity Calculations***

A primary goal of the study was to estimate the quantity of food, energy, and water that could be harvested from the Eastlake study area, and by extrapolation, East Bay neighborhoods in general.

1. Extensive Green Roof
2. Intensive Green Roof-Vegetable Garden
3. Intensive Green Roof-Herb Garden
4. Rooftop Hydroponic Garden
5. Solar Photovoltaic Electricity

**Indicators,**

**Variables, Factors:**

- A rooftop resource development philosophy is emerging and taking root in the Bay Area. Building owners and developers are looking at the options of solar power, rainwater catchment and living roofs to maximize their buildings' efficiency and function. Designers and planners are coming
- **Roof Types**
- **Seismicity**
- **Rainwater collection**

**Findings:**

- The findings of the assessment demonstrate a great deal of potential for harvesting food, energy, and water on Bay Area roofs.
- This Neighborhood Assessment conclusively demonstrates that rooftop resources can be developed on existing buildings in the Bay Area without structural improvements. Furthermore, future developments would gain considerable benefits by planning for intensive, edible roof gardens.

**Recommendations:**

Today, it *is* possible for building owners to install rooftop technologies and improve water quality, save energy, grow fresh produce, generate clean electricity, and contribute to greater community resilience and livability. The promise of a healthier environment and greater resource security makes it imperative that we begin planning and implementing for these sustainable rooftop systems now.

Education and leadership can bring about the kinds of benefits that so many cities have successfully demonstrated. Policy and government support are essential keys to fostering the implementation of these systems. Rooftops are currently untapped resources and a package of appropriate design, development incentives, and public support is crucial to fulfilling their great potential.

## **Groundwork Oakland Feasibility Study and Strategic Plan**

**Year Completed:** May 2006

**Study Category:** Parks and Open Space

**Produced By:** Urban Ecology with assistance from National Park Service - Rivers, Trails Conservation Assistance Program

**Author(s):** Amy Tanner, Donald Neuwirth, Linda Stonier

**Client/Reader:** Groundwork Oakland Steering Committee

**Geography:** Oakland, CA

### **Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative**

- Oakland's parks and natural areas are extensive, beloved by its residents, but badly in need of better maintenance. This situation, presents an opportunity for building community stewardship, through partnerships with neighborhood groups, other nonprofits, businesses and public agencies, on their behalf. This Feasibility Study/Strategic Plan identifies the need and niche for a Groundwork Trust to do just that.
- The City of Oakland already has over 3,000 acres of parks and natural areas. At the same time, the City, nonprofit organizations, and community members are actively working to increase park acreage, especially in park-poor neighborhoods. Like many other cities across the country, despite its love for parks, Oakland struggles to adequately maintain its public open spaces.
- Groundwork Oakland's mission is to bring about the sustained regeneration, improvement and management of the physical environment by developing community-based partnerships, which empower people, businesses and organizations to promote environmental, economic and social well-being.
- Groundwork Oakland will accomplish this mission by building stewardship to improve the quality of parks, recreation centers, medians, school grounds, creek corridors, natural areas and underutilized open space including brownfields.

**Key Stakeholders:** Oakland residents, groups dedicated to improving Oakland's green spaces, City of Oakland

**Methodology:** The Study includes a review of existing conditions of Oakland's parks, green

spaces and natural areas; results of a survey and in-depth interviews of over 50 groups and individuals involved in improving parks, green spaces and natural areas; a description of 7 proposed projects; identification of potential funding sources; and a suggested organizational structure and launching strategy.

- To evaluate the need and niche for a Groundwork Oakland, the Steering Committee asked a diverse range of stakeholders to identify the most critical problems facing Oakland's parks, green spaces and natural areas.
- Respondents then also ranked the following proposed programs for a Groundwork Trust in order of expected effectiveness to address the problems: park policy/advocacy, environmental education, volunteer coordination and stewardship, and job training for youth.
- The suggested mission, programs and activities listed below for Groundwork Oakland were developed with leadership from the Oakland Parks Coalition, guidance from the Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program of the National Park Service, and through many discussions over close to a year with park advocates, community organizations, as well as City staff and officials.
- Key aspects of the research and analysis for this study were: an online survey (with a 49% response rate) of organizations and individuals working in parks or on park related projects, interviews of over 20 key stakeholders, four exploratory meetings with potential partners and examination of four organizations working on behalf of public parks and open spaces to glean best practices and help inform development of a set of proposed programs and projects for Groundwork Oakland.
- Groundwork Survey to identify needs: With an understanding that the causes for a decline in park maintenance are complex and interconnected, the Groundwork Oakland Steering Committee surveyed 30 stewards and non-profit staff working in parks, green spaces or natural areas to better assess where Groundwork Oakland could work most effectively on this issue.

**Indicators, Variables,  
Factors:**

- Perception of safety
- Perception of safety
- Littering/ illegal dumping
- Greening of landscape
- Opportunities for new or improved parks or open spaces
- Number of existing parks or open spaces
- Youth population proximity to parks and open spaces
- Community maintenance of parks and open spaces
- Physical activity amenities
- Underutilized parks or open spaces
- Total acreage of parks and open spaces
- Unequal access to and distribution of parks and open spaces
- Cost of creating and maintaining parks and open spaces
- View of parks and open spaces
- Partnerships dedicated to maintaining parks and open spaces
- Streetscape enhancement/ ambiance/ medians

- Parks as an element of urban design
- Underutilized parks or open spaces
- Greenways
- Bike and walking trails
- Waterfront
- Quality of life
- Social networks
- Mutual cooperation
- Political engagement
- Leadership skills
- Civic engagement/ public participation

**Findings:**

**Surveys/ Interviews**

- Overall, stakeholders confirmed a perceived need for the programs proposed by Groundwork Oakland, and indicated willingness to partner on projects with a Groundwork Oakland.
- Stakeholders identified funding as the biggest obstacle to Groundwork Oakland's success.
- The major impediment to going forward is the Steering Committee's difficulty in recruiting community members with the commitment, leadership and other skills necessary to establish the Board of Directors, even on an interim basis.
- The most common responses to the survey question "What is not getting done in Oakland in the arena of parks and green spaces/natural areas?" were:
  - Lack of resources/staff dedicated to maintenance
  - Lack of public education about the importance of caring for the local environment
  - Lack of horticultural skills among City gardeners
  - Lack of accountability and poor management of maintenance crews
  - Lack of maintenance standards
  - Unclear budget priorities and lack of fiscal transparency
  - Lack of volunteer support
  - City bureaucracy is difficult to navigate.
- In subsequent in-depth interviews of 32 key park stewards, nonprofit staff working in parks, green spaces or natural areas, and City agency staff, the Steering Committee asked respondents whether they agreed or not with these statements, and whether each was a critical problem facing parks in Oakland. Many interviewees acknowledged that it was difficult to prioritize which problem was most critical as many of them are interrelated. The statements most frequently identified as critical problems are listed below in descending order:
  - Lack of resources for park maintenance
  - Lack of public education about the importance of caring for the environment
  - Lack of skilled gardeners, lack of accountability and unclear budget priorities
  - Lack of volunteer support, lack of maintenance standards and difficulty in navigating the City bureaucracy.

**Prioritization of Program Areas**

Survey respondents and interviewees were asked to rank the following four proposed program areas by their potential ability to address the critical problems:

- Volunteer Coordination and Stewardship
- Environmental Education For Youth and Adults
- Job Training and Employment for Youth
- Park Policy / Advocacy

Survey respondents ranked the proposed programs in the following order:

<b><i>Volunteers</i></b>	<b><i>Policy/Advocacy</i></b>	<b><i>Education</i></b>	<b><i>Jobs</i></b>
82% *	53%	53%	11%

(\*Survey respondents' first and second priorities were combined.)

Interviewees ranked the proposed programs in the following order:

<b><i>Policy/Advocacy</i></b>	<b><i>Education</i></b>	<b><i>Volunteers</i></b>	<b><i>Jobs</i></b>
70% *	40%	40%	40%

(\*Interviewees' first and second priorities were combined.)

When program choices of interviewees were weighted, the proposed programs ranked in the following order:

<b><i>Policy/Advocacy</i></b>	<b><i>Education</i></b>	<b><i>Volunteers</i></b>	<b><i>Jobs</i></b>
29 points out of 100	28 points out of 100	24 points out of 100	19 points out of 100

**Potential Partnerships**

- Oakland has a diverse and rich landscape of people and organizations working in parks, green spaces and natural areas. Of the 30 respondents of the Groundwork Oakland survey, most identified themselves as unincorporated groups who spend 75-100% of their time working at the local level to improve a park, green space, or natural area. Over 85% of the groups receive assistance from the City such as supplies, tools, waste pickup, meeting space, and in a few cases funding.
- When specifically asked whether they would be potentially willing to partner with a new Groundwork Oakland, 86% percent of survey respondents said yes and 89% said they had projects that may benefit from a partnership with Groundwork Oakland.
- Of the groups interviewed, 60% said they would be willing to partner with Groundwork Oakland, 26% were unsure.

**Summary of Need**

- First, Oakland is in need of an organization that works to build stewardship of parks, green spaces and natural areas from a citywide perspective.
- Second, Oakland is in need of an organization that looks at the

maintenance of parks, green spaces and natural areas from a citywide perspective.

### **Assets**

- The City of Oakland can proudly boast of more than 3,000 acres of parks and natural areas. With over 130 city parks, 25 recreation centers, 1,600 acres of resource conservation areas, 15 creeks, 19 miles of shoreline and the country's first Wildlife Refuge, Oakland offers a diverse array of active and passive recreation opportunities, to Oakland residents and regional visitors.
- According to the City's 1996 Open Space Conservation and Recreation element in the General Plan, Oakland is also committed to increasing park and recreation opportunities, especially in underserved neighborhoods. To that effect, Oakland has added 300 acres of parks and natural areas since 1995, and currently 22 projects are under design or development.

### **Financial Resources**

- The survey and interviews conducted for this Study identified lack of fiscal resources as one of the primary reasons for the decline in park maintenance.
- During a decade in which park maintenance budgets have steadily declined in Oakland, new parklands have been added, associated maintenance costs have dramatically increased, and maintenance crews have been unable to keep up with the growing needs of parks, green spaces and natural areas.
- Oakland relies primarily on the Lighting and Landscape Assessment District (LLAD), a property tax formed in 1989 and reconfirmed by property owners in 1993, to pay for park maintenance. However, a failure to include a cost of living increase in the original legislation has resulted in chronic budget deficits.
- Revenues generated by an enhanced LLAD would cover little more than existing service levels – service levels that OPC surveys have already shown are insufficient. While an enhanced LLAD would cover cost of living increases, no source limited funding exists to provide the additional maintenance funds needed for newly acquired or renovated parklands.
- A continuation of organized advocacy – in the supportive and collaborative style that OPC has used for the past four years – for maintenance, will be necessary to ensure that parks are adequately funded and that new policies supporting standards and evaluation are adopted and implemented.
- There is currently no other organized group besides OPC in Oakland that advocates for the funding of maintenance in parks, green spaces and natural areas at a citywide level, nor is there any existing organization willing to take on this critical role.
- There is a clear need in Oakland for more park, green space and natural area volunteers, however no organization or program is currently nurturing new growth in this area.

**Recommendations: *Mission, Programs, and Projects***

- Based on its findings, the Steering Committee recommends establishing Groundwork Oakland as an independent nonprofit that works collaboratively with Oakland residents, nonprofit organizations and the City of Oakland to enhance Oakland's physical, social and economic environments by building stewardship to improve the quality of parks, recreation centers, medians, school grounds, creek corridors, natural areas and underutilized open space including brownfields.
- Groundwork Oakland will have four core program areas: Volunteer Coordination and Stewardship (VCS), Environmental Education for Youth and Adults (EEYA), Park Policy/Advocacy (PPA), and Job Training for Youth (JTY).
- Through outreach and in consultation with potential partners, the Steering Committee also identified the following initial potential projects for a new Groundwork Oakland:
  - ***Park Stewardship Development*** in Conjunction with the City's Capital Projects in the Peralta Creek and Arroyo Viejo Watersheds, Raimondi Field, and Sobrante Park
  - ***Internet-Based Volunteer Resource***
  - ***Community Park Monitoring and Evaluation***
  - ***Stewardship Skill-Building Resource***
  - ***Maintenance Budget Review***
  - ***Park Ranger Advocacy***
  - ***Litter Abatement Campaign***
  - ***Park Conservancy Development***
- The Steering Committee recommends that Groundwork Oakland initially focus on Volunteer Coordination and Stewardship (VCS) by partnering with the City's Watershed Improvement Program and the Friends of Sausal Creek to develop a stewardship group in either the Peralta Creek or Arroyo Viejo watershed. This project would support recent capital improvements made by the City and would benefit from the expertise of Friends of Sausal Creek.
- The Steering Committee also recommends that Groundwork Oakland immediately develop its organizational website as a resource for volunteer opportunities in Oakland's parks, green spaces and natural areas. The website and subsequent outreach through an email newsletter will help to establish Groundwork Oakland as an organization with a citywide scope.
- The Steering Committee also strongly recommends that Groundwork Oakland begin to pursue program development for Community Park Monitoring and Evaluation. Groundwork Oakland should begin to develop a more sustainable and technologically sophisticated model for conducting park evaluations in order to build stewardship and support its policy/advocacy efforts.

## **23rd Avenue Community Action Plan**

<b>Year Completed:</b>	2005
<b>Study Category:</b>	Neighborhood Quality
<b>Produced By:</b>	Urban Ecology
<b>Author(s):</b>	Robert Hickey, Sara McKay, Diana Williams, Jess Wendover, Steven Lavoie
<b>Client/Reader:</b>	Local organizations and city staff and legislators.
<b>Geography:</b>	San Antonio Neighborhood
<b>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</b>	The 23rd Avenue Community Action Plan is a comprehensive plan for overcoming key neighborhood challenges—especially street crime, pedestrian hazards and vacant storefronts.
<b>Key Stakeholders:</b>	Local organizations can use the 23rd Avenue Action Plan to raise funds for priority projects. Local city council members, planning staff and Public Works officials can use the plan to advocate the delivery of city and state resources to the neighborhood. Oakland's Planning and Zoning Division can use the plan as the basis for developing a neighborhood specific area plan.
<b>Methodology:</b>	Community-driven blueprint: More than 250 residents and merchants collaborated to articulate this plan through large community workshops and focus groups. Workshops were conducted in six languages to ensure active participation from a diversity of stakeholders.
<b>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</b>	INDICATORS and VARIABLES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Business activity</li><li>▪ Street beautification</li><li>▪ Improved public services</li><li>▪ Household size</li><li>▪ Number of families</li><li>▪ Number of renters</li><li>▪ Households on public assistance</li><li>▪ Persons in Poverty</li><li>▪ Community Assets:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Public schools</li><li>- Community service organizations</li><li>- Garfield Park</li></ul></li><li>▪ Building age</li><li>▪ Building façade quality</li><li>▪ Building setbacks</li></ul>

- Vacant buildings/under-utilized properties
- Presence of prostitution
- Liquor sales
- Loitering
- Drug transactions
- Gang activity
- Open Space per resident
- Rate of pedestrian accidents
- Traffic circulation
- Maintenance of stop signs and crosswalks
- Street light timing
- Bus service
- Visual marker for entry to business district
- Designation political boundaries
- Land use patterns
- Public safety:
  - Crime
  - Speeding traffic

#### FACTORS

- 23rd Avenue neighborhood is one of the most diverse communities in the country
- 35 languages are spoken locally in the neighborhood
- A network of innovative nonprofits and community artists provide residents with after-school programming, job and literacy training, cultural performances, counseling on home ownership opportunities and vehicles for community and merchant organizing.
- Despite retaining physical elements of a neighborhood commercial district—historic character, small storefronts, sidewalks and metered parking—the district is not a destination for neighborhood residents. Safety is an urgent concern. Residents feel threatened by criminal activity, and speeding traffic on auto-dominated streets. Traffic accidents involving children are the highest in the city. With drug dealing and prostitution finding refuge in and around the business district, many avoid the district altogether, further allowing it to be put to criminal uses. Residents—many of whom do not own cars—must travel long distances to find fresh and affordable groceries, and meet other daily needs.
- Four themes emerged from the workshops and focus groups to form the basis of the 23rd Avenue Community Action Plan:
  1. Lower San Antonio's cultural diversity is its greatest asset—use it to drive the revitalization of the business district;
  2. New housing and stores will help bring life into the neighborhood—find ways to encourage development;
  3. We need solutions to the issues on our streets—slow traffic, fix sidewalks, fund art projects and make the streets safe; and
  4. We want more public services—a library, or a post office. And clean up the streets!

- Most of the 23rd Avenue corridor falls within the boundaries of Oakland's Central City East (CCE) Redevelopment Area. Inclusion in a redevelopment area represents a substantial opportunity for the neighborhood to receive funding and resources for neighborhood revitalization. One way this happens is through "tax increment financing."

**Findings:**

Challenges:

- Identity: Lacking visual markers at the entrance to the business district, 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue tends to get lost between Fruitvale and Eastlake.
- Political Boundaries: The designation of 23rd Avenue as a boundary between council districts means local leaders must work through two sets of city staff to find comprehensive solutions to neighborhood challenges.
- Land Use: Uneven commercial land use patterns along 23rd Avenue and the concentration of auto uses along International Boulevard limit pedestrian activity and are not appropriate to a neighborhood business district.
- Safety: Community safety issues take two forms: (1) frequent criminal activity that presents a substantial challenge to attracting businesses, and (2) streets dominated by fast moving automobiles. Together, they are barriers to creating a healthy pedestrian environment, a working business district and a safe neighborhood.

**Recommendations:**

The recommendations of the plan are organized under five strategies:

1. Safe Streets

Increased foot traffic in and around the 23rd Avenue Business District is crucial for deterring crime. A more appealing and comfortable walking environment with fewer traffic threats will draw more residents and visitors to 23rd Avenue's sidewalks. New trees and pedestrian street lighting will play an important role in making 23rd Avenue safer and more appealing. High-visibility crosswalks and mosaic curb-bulbouts will make hostile intersections safer to cross. Decorative banners, trash cans, benches and public art will bring new life, color and distinctiveness to the district. A new arts plaza will double as a bold entryway to 23rd Avenue, and a means for narrowing the dangerous intersection at Foothill Boulevard / 23rd Avenue. A narrower Foothill Boulevard, with bulbouts of its own, will calm traffic running past Garfield Elementary, and protect Garfield students, bus patrons and pedestrians of all ages from speeding cars.

2. Art and Learning

New arts and educational centers will help bring the district alive with positive activities, day and night, deterring street crime, and offering local opportunities for learning and cultural exploration. A new community cultural center, with performance space and classrooms, will offer a stable, central space for arts and cultural programming, and draw people to after-school programs and evening events. New educational programming will help fill other 23rd Avenue storefronts.

3. Beneficial Development

Residents of the 23rd Avenue neighborhood want to facilitate new development that strengthens the community—development that is affordable to a diversity of

residents, makes 23rd Avenue more active, incorporates safety-enhancing design, encourages pedestrian activity and enhances existing cultural resources. Zoning changes that promote mixed-use development will help accomplish this goal. Urban Ecology's Design Guidelines for 23rd Avenue will encourage developers to choose design features that invite pedestrians, emphasize what is special about 23rd Avenue and make criminal activity more difficult. Active collaboration with affordable housing developers will increase the stock of affordable housing, and provide safeguards against displacement.

#### 4. Thriving Businesses

Stronger neighborhood businesses will add more reasons to go to 23rd Avenue, and help make it a bustling center. A Business Improvement District will provide private funding for keeping 23rd Avenue clean, secure and well-marketed. Changes to the city's Façade Improvement Program will make it more responsive to the needs of local businesses. As existing retail gets stronger, new businesses—like a restaurant, hardware store, apparel outlet, school supply store, laundromat and grocery—will fill empty storefronts, create a livelier streetscape, and provide more opportunities for residents and local employees to shop or eat locally.

#### 5. Accessible Services

New and revamped public services can play a major role in sparking 23rd Avenue neighborhood revitalization. A new library branch and affordable legal services on 23rd Avenue will provide high-demand services while adding life to the street. City investment in a community policing partnership that builds trust with 23rd Avenue community organizations will create the potential for creative solutions to ongoing safety problems. Follow-up attention to Garfield Park will bring more healthy activities that meet the needs of nearby children and families.

***Oak to Ninth Avenue Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 3: Parks and Natural Spaces (DRAFT)***

<b><i>Year Completed:</i></b>	2006
<b><i>Study Category:</i></b>	Parks and Open Space
<b><i>Produced By:</i></b>	UC Berkeley Health Impact Group
<b><i>Author(s):</i></b>	Rajiv Bhatia, Tom Rivard, and Edmund Seto
<b><i>Client/Reader:</i></b>	City decision-makers, City planning staff, Community organizations, Developers
<b><i>Geography:</i></b>	Oak to Ninth Avenue
<b><i>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</i></b>	This HIA assesses the Oak to Ninth Avenue development project by looking at how the project as proposed affects the conditions required for optimal health.
<b><i>Key Stakeholders:</i></b>	Community Members and Developers
<b><i>Methodology:</i></b>	<p>The Oak to Ninth HIA also differs from the traditional EIA in several significant ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ HIA complements analysis required under CEQA;</li><li>▪ HIA evaluates environmental, social, and economic effects using the lens of human health;</li><li>▪ HIA estimates benefits as well as adverse consequences;</li><li>▪ HIA evaluates the distribution of impacts on different populations; and,</li><li>▪ HIA uses quantitative and qualitative methods.</li></ul> <p>Methods used by UCBHIG in conducting this analysis include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Review of the empirical and scientific literature related to this project</li><li>▪ Review of public standards, objectives, regulations, and guidance relevant to planning and health</li><li>▪ Planning document review</li><li>▪ Interviews and dialogue with key stakeholders</li><li>▪ Secondary data analysis</li><li>▪ GIS Mapping</li><li>▪ Quantitative forecasting</li><li>▪ Review and analysis of public comment and testimony</li></ul>
<b><i>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</i></b>	<p>VARIABLES and INDICATORS</p> <p><i>Public Space Design Elements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Plazas</li><li>▪ Squares</li><li>▪ Courtyards</li><li>▪ Parks</li></ul>

- Community Gardens
- Greenways
- Bike and Walking Trails
- Waterfront
- Access

*Health-related Functions of Parks and Natural Space*

Via human activity:

- Physical activity
- Recreation
- Leisure
- Respite / Relaxation
- Social interaction

Via environmental quality:

- Air quality
- Water quality
- Reduce heat island effect
- Habitat preservation
- Views

*Health Outcomes*

Reductions in Disease Outcomes:

- Premature Mortality
- Obesity
- Mortality
- Cardiovascular disease
- Hypertension
- Diabetes
- Depression
- ADHD
- Respiratory diseases

Health Promotion:

- Happiness and well-being
- Focus and attention
- Problem solving “effectiveness”
- Recovery from illness
- Productivity
- Stress reduction
- Restorative
- Reduction in social isolation
- Community/social cohesion

Reductions in Exposure to Contaminants in:

- Drinking water
- Swimming locations
- Fish
- Air

FACTORS:

- The Oak to Ninth area comprises approximately 64 acres of waterfront property owned by the Port of Oakland. The proposed project includes up

to 3,100 residential units, 200,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space, 3,500 structured parking spaces, approximately 29.9 acres of public open space, two renovated marinas, and a wetlands restoration area.

**Findings:**

- The Oak to Ninth Project will result in a new residential neighborhood rich in park resources; this will have positive health benefits for the residents of this new neighborhood.
- The Oak to Ninth Project represents a net loss of 15 acres of open space relative to existing planning designations under the Oakland General Plan Estuary Policy Plan; this represents the loss of a significant health resource for Oakland as a whole.
- Unmitigated physical and social barriers between the proposed estuary and waterfront resources and upland neighborhoods will limit the potential health benefits of the project to Oakland residents. This represents a missed opportunity to improve the health of Oakland residents.
  - Elements of the Project, particularly the large residential buildings, create potential physical and social barriers to views and public access to public park resources along the Estuary and Waterfront.
  - Physical barriers, including the rail corridor and the I-880 freeway corridor create a significant obstacle to convenient public access from upland and park-poor neighborhoods.
  - The project did not include planning or design for functional access between upland neighborhoods and proposed public park resources along the estuary and waterfront.
  - Existing preliminary work on estuary access (e.g., 5th Avenue Multi-modal transportation design work) was not reflected in the development proposals to the City.
  - Facility and operations planning for the proposed parks do not reflect input and needs of residents of upland neighborhoods.
  - The community benefits district proposed for the park risks functional privatization of park resources.
- There is roughly one acre of city park land for every 1,000 Oakland residents.
- Evaluation of the distribution of city parks in Oakland found that nearly two-thirds of Oakland youth (under the age of 18) did not live within the recommended distance of any parks and 90% did not live within recommended distance of a large park.

**Recommendations:**

- Create safe, continuous, and functional routes connecting the waterfront to adjacent neighborhoods. At a minimum, an inviting route should exist along the estuary channel and along 5th Avenue.
- Provide public transit services directly to the waterfront.
- Increase public parking adjacent to waterfront park resources.
- Ensure the socio-economic integration of project housing.
- Explore design changes to improve visibility of the waterfront.
- Explore re-routing the Embarcadero between the residential uses and the public waterfront.
- Include residents of upland neighborhoods in park planning.
- Create seats for citywide interests on all oversight bodies for project parks.



## ***The East Bay Greenway Health Impact Assessment***

<b><i>Year Completed:</i></b>	2007
<b><i>Study Category:</i></b>	Pedestrian and Bicycle Access
<b><i>Produced By:</i></b>	Urban Ecology
<b><i>Author(s):</i></b>	Jonathan Heller and Rajiv Bhatia, Human Impact Partners
<b><i>Client/Reader:</i></b>	City decision-makers, City planning staff, Community organizations, Developers
<b><i>Geography:</i></b>	Elevated BART tracks in the Oakland to Hayward corridor.
<b><i>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</i></b>	This health impact assessment (HIA) analyses the health impacts of the proposed Greenway. It identifies factors that contribute to or inhibit physical activity, social cohesion, greening of the landscape, reducing motor vehicle use. It also investigates the safety concerns of the Greenway.
<b><i>Key Stakeholders:</i></b>	Users of the East Bay Greenway
<b><i>Methodology:</i></b>	Steps for the East Bay Greenway HIA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Scoping</i> is when people involved in the HIA – public health officials, community members, planners, etc. – decide what to analyze (e.g., which health impacts) and how (which methods to employ).</li><li>▪ <i>Analysis</i> of impacts uses existing data and qualitative and quantitative research to estimate the magnitude and direction of potential effects on health status or determinants of health status.</li><li>▪ <i>Reporting</i> can take the form of a written report or public testimony.</li></ul>
<b><i>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</i></b>	INDICATORS and VARIABLES <i>Indicators of focus for this HIA:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Physical activity</li><li>▪ Social interaction</li><li>▪ Greening of the landscape</li><li>▪ Motor vehicle use</li></ul> <i>Other Indicators</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Perception of safety</li><li>▪ Pedestrian and bicycle injuries/fatalities</li><li>▪ Violent crime</li><li>▪ Health Impacts:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-overweight, obesity, and diabetes</li><li>-mental health</li><li>-cardiovascular disease</li><li>-pedestrian and bicycle related injuries</li><li>-osteoporosis</li><li>-lengthening lifespan</li></ul></li></ul>

- Quality of life
- Health care costs
- Neglected open space
- Access to walkable and bikeable streets
- Impairment of mobility of elderly
- Psychological well-being/stress
- Increased driving
- Air pollution
- Noise pollution
- Global warming
- Ability to maintain green space
- Government funding
- Economic diversity
- Racial diversity
- Residential diversity
- Land use designations
- Acres of park per resident
- Physical activity amenities
- Maintenance costs
- Suicide rates
- Diversity of social spots

*Community Health Determinants Included in the HIA Scoping Process:*

- Housing: adequate shelter; affordability; physical hazards; displacement/ dislocation; disinvestment/ blight
- Air Quality: pollutants in outdoor air and indoor air; environmental tobacco smoke
- Noise: environmental; occupational
- Safety: violent crime; property crime; fire hazards; traffic hazards; (lighting?)
- Social Networks: contact with and support from friends and family
- Nutrition: food costs; food quality; food safety; proximity of food resources
- Parks and Natural Space: park quality; park services; park access
- Private Goods and Services: quality and proximity of financial institutions; childcare services; health services
- Public Services: quality and proximity of health services
- Transportation: access to jobs, goods, services and educational resources; nonmotorized travel; vehicle miles
- Social Equity: proportion of the population living in relative poverty; attitudes towards/ stereotypes of minority racial, social and ethnic groups; segregation of residences
- Livelihood: security of employment; wages and income; benefits and leave; job hazards; job autonomy; economic diversity
- Water Quality: contaminants in drinking water; infectious agents in drinking water; recreational water quality
- Education: school quality; school proximity
- Democratic process: degree and quality of participation in public decision making; government accountability

**FACTORS**

*Potential Benefits of Use*

- Lack of pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly streets and trails is recognized as one of the leading systemic causes for failure to achieve minimum recommended amounts of physical activity in urban environments in the United States.
- The communities the Greenway will serve lack sufficient parks and trails and therefore there is potential that building the Greenway will lead to more people being more active and to associated positive health outcomes.
- Studies have shown that social interactions can increase lifespan, improve mental health, and reduce crime and its associated health outcomes.
- Proximity to and views of pleasant landscaping can reduce stress and speed recovery from illness and can promote environmental stewardship. Proper design, maintenance and budgeting are necessary components for an open space that is and remains pleasant to be in and to view. These factors will therefore determine the extent to which the Greenway has this positive impact.
- Reduced motor vehicle use, as people may choose to walk or bike instead of drive. This could have several positive health impacts related to improving air quality, reducing noise, and reducing motor vehicle related accidents. Having trails can promote walking and biking to neighborhood destinations such as stores, schools, churches and friends.

*Potential Barriers to Use*

- Potential barriers to use include safety concerns, excessive noise (e.g., from BART), poor air quality, and/or lack of: maintenance, convenient access, awareness, programming, necessary amenities, or connectivity to other destinations or trails.
- The extent to which a transportation mode shift occurs depends on many factors including the connectivity of the new Greenway to existing walking/biking routes and desired destinations, awareness of the existence of the Greenway, and safety/perceived safety of the Greenway.

**Findings:**

N/A

**Recommendations:**

*Recommended Strategies for Physical Activity*

- Ensuring that people feel safe getting to and from the Greenway and on it (see Safety section below)
- Ensuring that noise is not a deterrent to use
- Designing physical activity amenities likely to be used by local population and not available elsewhere
- Programming structured activities for the Greenway to draw low income and at risk groups, such as coordinated bike rides or walks
- Separating biking and walking paths
- Designing the Greenway to minimize maintenance costs, for example by using native plants
- Including educational outreach at schools, churches, and senior centers after Greenway is complete that includes information on the benefits of physical activity and on proper use (e.g., biking rules)
- Using universal design principles to allow access for all
- Including water fountains, bike racks, shade areas, and 1/4 mile markers

- Surveying walkers, runners, bicyclists, children on tricycles, skateboarders, rollerbladers, elderly in wheelchairs, parents with strollers, dog walkers and any other potential users of the park as to their needs and desires.

#### *Recommended Strategies for Social Cohesion*

- Include design elements to encourage gathering such as plazas, spaces for parents with kids, benches positioned for encouraging interaction (not linear arrangements), and tables with checkerboards etched on to them
- Consider “Adopt-a-trail” programs to maintain the trail and build social capital
- Capitalize on existing programming (e.g., sports) in the neighborhoods it passes through, by expanding that programming or creating new programs that are complementary
- Work with government on incentives and zoning to encourage creation of social spots (e.g., coffee shops) adjacent to the trail and discourage the siting of liquor stores nearby

#### *Recommended Strategies for Greening the Landscape*

- Use of indigenous plants and other design elements to maximize landscaping and minimize maintenance costs
- Design of a maintenance plan and ensuring that the budget for maintenance is covered
- Starting “Adopt-a-trail” programs to maintain the trail

#### *Recommended Strategies for Reduced Motor Vehicle Use*

- Working with other neighboring project sites to complete safe routes
- Connecting the Greenway to interiors of neighborhoods with enhanced bike lanes and sidewalks so that it is easy to connect to the Greenway from one's home
- Working with planning staff in the various jurisdictions to connect the Greenway to redevelopment projects
- Performing outreach to local schools about the Greenway as a walking/biking route to school
- Performing outreach to local employers about the Greenway and about bike friendly policies.

#### *Recommended Strategies for Maximizing Safety Potential*

- Ensure road crossings are safe and not a source of increased pedestrian/bicyclist accidents. Efforts should be focused on intersections that currently have many accidents, hotspots shown in the maps in figures 5 through 9, and parts of the Greenway where vulnerable populations (e.g., children) are expected to be heavy users. Traffic calming to lower traffic speeds near the Greenway could greatly enhance safety. Additionally, traffic lights with countdown pedestrian signals, curb bulbs, center medians and other such measures could be used
- Disallow curbside parking near the Greenway intersections
- Ensure adequate lighting on the roadways as well as proper tree maintenance so lighting sources are not blocked

- Ensure proper sight lines
- Ensure proper separation and/or integration with city streets
- Partner with bike groups to teach bike safety at schools and community centers
- Create a buffer zone – a wide strip of grass for example – between the Greenway and neighboring streets that run parallel to the Greenway trails
- Separate trails for bikes and pedestrians to avoid collisions between those modes

*Potential mitigations to crime include:*

- Start an Urban Park Rangers program to patrol the Greenway
- Organize neighborhood watch groups
- Increase police presence and police bike patrol
- Start a bike group and/or walking group safety patrol
- Coordinate with NCPC in areas in which they are active
- Ensure adequate lighting on the trails
- Ensure proper sight lines and "eyes on street"
- Install call boxes
- Install cameras
- Ensure police buy-in during the design process
- Include strategies to build social cohesion described above
- Work with government on incentives and zoning to encourage creation of social spots (e.g., coffee shops) adjacent to the trail and discourage the siting of liquor stores nearby

**Mac Arthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 3: Transportation (DRAFT)**

<b>Year Completed:</b>	2007
<b>Study Category:</b>	Transportation
<b>Produced By:</b>	UC Berkeley Health Impact Group
<b>Author(s):</b>	Tom Rivard
<b>Client/Reader:</b>	City decision-makers, City planning staff, Community organizations, Developers
<b>Geography:</b>	Mac Arthur BART Transit Village (MBTV) and surrounding neighborhood. Though the actual project is located east of the I-580 corridor, since the station is adjacent to neighborhoods west of I-580, these neighborhoods will be affected by impacted by design decisions for the MRTV.
<b>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</b>	This health impact assessment (HIA) identifies factors that contribute to a healthier, safer environment for the redevelopment of the Mac Arthur BART station area.
<b>Key Stakeholders:</b>	Community Members, Developers
<b>Methodology:</b>	Health Impact Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Survey Pedestrian Environmental Quality in area</li><li>▪ Describe status and needs of bike lane network for area</li><li>▪ Estimate vehicle use reductions and increases in transit and walking trips using URBEMIS</li><li>▪ Assess parking demand for the project</li><li>▪ Explore identify all feasible transportation demand management approaches that might be feasibly applied to the project.</li><li>▪ Survey residents on what modes of travel they use and why including student transportation modes</li><li>▪ Review BART access study in progress.</li></ul>
<b>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</b>	INDICATORS and VARIABLES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Diversity of land use</li><li>▪ Density of land use</li><li>▪ Design of land use</li><li>▪ Transportation system access</li><li>▪ Residential units built</li><li>▪ Vehicle miles traveled</li><li>▪ Regional vehicle trips</li><li>▪ Neighborhood vehicle trips</li><li>▪ Demand for road construction</li><li>▪ Water quality</li></ul>

- Noise
- Circulatory and respiratory disease
- Contributions to green house gases
- Street connectivity
- Traffic calming design features
- Pedestrian and bicyclist hazards
- Community interaction
- Price structure parking
- Parking supply
- Car ownership rates
- Pedestrian and bicycle street crossing
- Streetscape enhancements (lights, trees, furniture, etc.)
- Open space
- Bicycle rack location
- Bicycle network connection
- Pedestrian sidewalks
- Retail diversity (access to goods and services)
- Intermodel transit connections

*Health-related Variables:*

- Physical activity (Obesity)
- Ambient Pollution
- Motor Vehicle Accident Injuries
- Social Networks
- Violent Injuries
- Stress
- Leisure Time
- Income
- Heat

**FACTORS**

- The distance of a travel trip exerts a strong influence on the decision to walk, or drive. Such factors include the design and spatial arrangement of neighborhoods, including street connectivity, public spaces, and the quality of the pedestrian realm; traffic characteristics such as vehicle volume, roadway width, traffic speed; and socioeconomic characteristics, including residential and commercial density, the intermixing of retail and commercial uses with residential uses, public spaces, auto-ownership, and safety.

***Findings:***

*Project Health Impacts*

1. MBTV will reduce the growth of vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled expected at a regional level, limiting deterioration in regional air quality and preventing associated circulatory and respiratory disease.(Beneficial Effect)
2. The project will facilitate routine physical activity for project residents. This will help prevent obesity, improve cardiovascular function, and increase community interaction. (Beneficial Effects)

3. Local vehicle trips will increase resulting in increases in pedestrian accidents and bicycle accidents on streets in the immediate vicinity. (Potential Adverse Effect)

**Recommendations:**

*Recommendations for design and mitigation*

1. Increase the density of the project by increasing the number of new units.
2. Increase the proportion of below market rate housing and housing units affordable to those with moderate incomes.
3. Unbundle the cost of parking from residential rents to encourage residents to reduce their car ownership rates.
4. Reduce the number of structured parking spaces for residential uses below a ratio of 3 spaces for 4 units.
5. Price structured residential parking and area residential parking permits at the market rate.
6. Increase parking costs for use of the BART station to reduce vehicle use and encourage local shuttle use.
7. Do not provide structured employee parking for BART or project commercial uses.
8. Provide free structured parking for car share.
9. Require transit shuttles to operate at least every 30 minutes in off peak and every 15 minutes during peak travel times with hours to match BART schedules.
10. Ensure the project is connected to the local bike network via class I or II bike lanes.
11. Ensure sidewalk bicycle racks are co-located with retail uses
12. Provide secure bicycle storage protected from the weather at BART.
13. Improve pedestrian and bicycle street crossing, especially at Telegraph & 40th and Telegraph & Mac Arthur intersections. If the pathway to transit is conducive to walking the area of TOD influence can expand beyond the normal  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile to as far as  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile thereby resulting in further reduction in VMT.
14. Enhance streetscape of the 40th Street underpass to provide connectivity for Westside residents and enhance the desirability of the transit village.
15. Incorporate retail diversity study in selecting new retail outlets for Mac Arthur BART. Retail should serve the needs of the local community thereby reducing trips originating both within and beyond the local neighborhood.



## ***West Oakland Community-Based Transportation Plan***

<b><i>Year Completed:</i></b>	2006
<b><i>Study Category:</i></b>	Transportation
<b><i>Produced By:</i></b>	Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
<b><i>Author(s):</i></b>	Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc., Elmwood Consulting, Harley and Associates
<b><i>Client/Reader:</i></b>	City Staff, Community Members
<b><i>Geography:</i></b>	West Oakland
<b><i>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</i></b>	This Plan is the result of a technical analysis and a series of community meetings and surveys conducted to identify transportation solutions to improve mobility in the low-income community of West Oakland.
<b><i>Key Stakeholders:</i></b>	West Oakland residents
<b><i>Methodology:</i></b>	Four phase process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Existing Plan Review</li><li>▪ Community Outreach Surveys and Discussions</li><li>▪ Community Group Discussions</li><li>▪ Funding and Planning Agency Discussions</li></ul>
<b><i>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</i></b>	INDICATORS and VARIABLES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Air pollution</li><li>▪ Air pollution health risks</li><li>▪ Asthma rates</li><li>▪ Transit access/service availability</li><li>▪ Public safety</li><li>▪ Bikeable streets</li><li>▪ Grocery store access</li><li>▪ School access</li><li>▪ Medical services access</li><li>▪ Access to jobs</li><li>▪ Government funding</li></ul> FACTORS <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Truck traffic and emissions</li><li>▪ BART noise</li><li>▪ Inadequate bus services</li><li>▪ The cost of public transit</li><li>▪ Need for coordination with transportation planning with local land use decisions</li><li>▪ Key Statistics:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Population</li></ul></li></ul>

People of color  
Households with poverty level income  
Car ownership  
Transit use

**Findings:**

**SURVEY FINDINGS**

The top five destination needs identified through the survey were:

- Grocery stores
- Medical appointments
- Downtown Oakland
- Shopping
- K-12 schools

The top five transportation needs identified through the survey were:

- Better facilities for walking—sidewalks, street lighting, trees, etc.
- BART and bus tickets to be less expensive
- More bus service on weekends, at night and early in the morning
- More frequent daytime bus service
- Buying and operating a care to be less expensive (purchase, insurance, gas, maintenance, etc.)

The top five solutions identified through the survey were:

- Providing a neighborhood shuttle service
- Increasing AC Transit service in the evenings and on weekends
- Making walking more attractive through lighting, sidewalks, trees, etc.
- Increasing the number of bus stop benches, canopies and enclosures
- Reducing pollution from diesel emissions.

**Recommendations:**

Top destination needs addressed through the following proposed projects:

- Improved AC Transit Bus Transit and/or new Community Shuttle
- Senior Shuttle Expansion
- Medical Service Access (taxi return)
- All pedestrian and bicycle facility improvement projects (6 separate projects)
- Cycles for Change
- Comprehensive Transportation/Land Use Plan

Top transportation needs addressed through the following proposed projects:

- All pedestrian facility improvement projects (3 separate projects)
- Traffic Calming: Peralta Street
- Youth Transit Subsidies
- Improved AC Transit Bus Service and/or new Community Shuttle
- Subsidized Car Sharing
- BART Access Evening Shuttle
- Comprehensive Transportation/Land Use Plan

Top solutions addressed through the following proposed projects:

- Improved AC Transit Bus Transit and/or new Community Shuttle
- Senior Shuttle Expansion

- All pedestrian facility improvement projects (3 separate projects)
- Truck Services at Oakland Army Base
- Truck Route Enforcement and Education
- Diesel Truck Replacement
- Comprehensive Transportation/Land Use Plan

#### SUMMARIZED REPORT AND STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Create pedestrian and bicycle friendly environment
- Create a network of walking routes to BART station
- Improve public safety
- Reduce/Manage/Eliminate truck traffic
- Provide non polluting shuttle service to connect to neighborhood sites
- Lower speed limits
- Narrow and calm the streets
- Streetscape improvements
- Transit Village implementation for BART station
- Increase transit feeder service to station
- Manage BART parking to increase efficient use of the spaces
- Maintain adequate supply of BART parking
- Create pedestrian corridor
- Create commercial corridor
- Improve evening, weekday, weekend AC Transit service
- Bus stop canopies
- Make transit more affordable
- Simplify complex trips
- Engage key partners to develop new public/private services for specific groups and targeted geographic areas.

## ***Central and East Oakland Community-Based Transportation Plan***

- Year Completed:*** 2007
- Study Category:*** Transportation
- Produced By:*** Produced for Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) and Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA)
- Author(s):*** Design Community & Environment in association with Nelson/Nygaard Consulting
- Client/Reader:*** Community organizations, Oakland City Council, City staff and transportation funding agencies
- Geography:*** The Central and East Oakland project area is bounded by Interstate 580 and Hillmont Drive to the east, the waterfront and Hegenberger Road to the west, Lake Merritt and downtown Oakland to the north, and the City of San Leandro to the south.
- Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative*** The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Community-Based Transportation Planning Program is a collaborative planning process that involves residents in minority and low-income Bay Area communities, community and faith-based organizations that serve them, transit operators, county congestion management agencies (CMAs) and MTC. The community-based approach identified barriers to mobility—problems in reaching shops, schools, jobs, medical services and other key destinations—and designed local solutions to these barriers. The planning process also worked to link community organizations to transportation funding agencies and transportation planners on an ongoing basis.
- Key Stakeholders:*** Community organizations, transportation funding agencies, and transportation planners
- Methodology:*** The plan built on previous transportation plans and studies in Central and East Oakland. The project team reviewed previously prepared transportation plans and studies relevant to the project area including those prepared by the City of Oakland, AC Transit, BART, and Alameda County. Projects identified in these previous studies provided a starting point for strategies to address community-identified transportation gaps.
- The project team worked closely with local community-based organizations including the Spanish Speaking Unity Council, East Bay Asian Youth Collaborative, Allen Temple, Urban Habitat and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) composed of local transportation agency representatives and City of Oakland staff. These groups provided important input on community outreach, project design and implementation strategies.
- While the limited Community-Based Transportation Plan budget precluded a truly random and statistically valid survey, the team obtained a broad sample of

opinions at various neighborhood locations including schools, senior centers, shopping areas and key transportation facilities such as AC Transit bus stops nearby BART stations, and major AC Transit transfer facilities such as the Eastmont Transit Center.

The survey results were analyzed by mode and geographic neighborhood. For each mode, the survey analysis identified key issues that the community identified as needing to be addressed.

Following the outreach analysis, the project team presented community outreach results to Oakland City Council members and staff to confirm findings and provide an opportunity for input on potential strategies. City Council members and staff provided guidance on strategy development, the project prioritization methodology, and appropriate meeting venues for strategy review and prioritization public workshops.

Following completion of the survey outreach analysis and review with Oakland City Council members and staff, the project team developed preliminary strategies. These preliminary strategies were reviewed in detail with likely implementing agencies through the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC included AC Transit, BART, City of Oakland Public Works, City of Oakland Redevelopment, and City of Oakland Paratransit for the Elderly and Disabled (OPED) Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA), and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency. Following TAC review, the draft solutions were taken to a series of public meetings in the Central and East Oakland Project Area for review and prioritization.

The project team summarized outreach results and draft strategies and attendees participated in a dot-voting exercise, ranking each of the existing draft strategies and recommended alternative strategies where needed. The strategy ranking was completed based on a synthesis of the criteria-based ranking and the community prioritization input.

***Indicators,  
Variables, Factors:***

**INDICATORS and VARIABLES**

- Housing tenure
- Housing type (single family, multifamily)
- Land uses
- Race and ethnicity
- Age distribution
- Language and linguistic isolation
- Household income
- Poverty level
- Vehicle availability
- Household size
- Elderly in households
- Mode of travel of work
- Rate of transit use
- Transit service
- Safety
- Walking network

- Pedestrian collisions
- Bicycle network
- Bicycle parking facilities
- Car sharing

#### FACTORS

The Central and East Oakland Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) is the result of technical analysis and a series of community meetings and surveys conducted in 2007 to identify transportation solutions to improve mobility in West Central and East Oakland. The Plan was designed to address the findings of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) 2001 Lifeline Transportation Network Report and MTC's Environmental Justice Report for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan. Both reports identified the need to support local planning efforts in low-income communities throughout the region.

#### **Findings:**

- The consultant team identified existing transit gaps in the Central and East Oakland project area by reviewing the following studies:
  - Fruitvale Alive! Community Transportation Plan
  - Coliseum/Oakland Airport BART Station: Access Plan
  - Fruitvale BART Station: Access Plan
  - International/Telegraph Corridor Rapid Bus Study – Phase II
  - AC Transit 2002 On-Board Passenger Survey: Results by Planning Area
- The consultant team identified existing pedestrian and bicycle network gaps in the Central and East Oakland project area by reviewing the following studies:
  - Fruitvale Alive! Community Transportation Plan
  - Oakland Bicycle Master Plan
  - City of Oakland Pedestrian Master Plan
  - Coliseum/Oakland Airport BART Station Access Plan
  - 23rd Avenue Community Action Plan
  - Coliseum BART to Bay Trail Connector

#### **Recommendations:**

Goals and objectives were developed by the project team in response to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) guidance on CBTP preparation, Technical Advisory Committee input, and in consultation with Oakland City Council to guide the Central and East Oakland CBTP community outreach process. They include:

- Goal 1: Identify broadly shared transportation needs across the target demographic groups including low-income households, seniors, youth, disabled persons, and linguistically-isolated populations.
- Goal 2: Identify transportation solutions directly supported by the target demographic community members
- Goal 3: Build capacity among community-based organizations in the project area, including greater knowledge of transportation planning and improved skills used to affect transportation improvements
- Goal 4: Directly engage neighborhood youth in the outreach data gathering and analysis
- Goal 5: Document which outreach strategies were most effective and

contribute the best to a model neighborhood transportation planning process.

The recommended transportation strategies respond directly to the community-identified needs documented through the outreach process. Each strategy was also analyzed by potential implementing agencies through the TAC.

- Multi-Modal Strategies
- AC Transit Bus Operations Strategies
- Transit Information Strategies
- Transit Affordability Strategies
- Expand Oakland Paratransit for the Elderly and Disabled (OPED) Service
- Bicycle Strategies
- Subsidized Car Sharing

## ***Roadblocks to Health: Transportation Barriers to Health Communities***

<b><i>Year Completed:</i></b>	2002
<b><i>Study Category:</i></b>	Transportation
<b><i>Produced By:</i></b>	Transportation and Land Use Coalition (TALC), Center for Third World Organizing (CTWO), People for a Better Oakland (PUEBLO)
<b><i>Author(s):</i></b>	Jeff Hobson, TALC; Julie Quiroz-Martinez, CTWO; Cameron Yee, PUEBLO
<b><i>Client/Reader:</i></b>	TALC staff, Community-based organizations, City and County Agencies
<b><i>Geography:</i></b>	Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara Counties
<b><i>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</i></b>	This report is an examination of transportation barriers to health care, nutritious food, and physical activity in low-income communities. The report analyzes the connection between community health, transit, and land use planning. It reflects a focus on the intersection between racial justice organizing and transportation policy.
<b><i>Key Stakeholders:</i></b>	Residents of low-income neighborhoods in Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara Counties.
<b><i>Methodology:</i></b>	Transit Accessibility Analysis: GIS analysis identifies the number of people in selected neighborhoods who have transit or pedestrian access to health care facilities and supermarkets.
<b><i>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</i></b>	<p>INDICATORS and VARIABLES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Transit access</li><li>▪ Barriers to walking and bicycling</li><li>▪ Access to health care facilities</li><li>▪ Access to supermarkets</li><li>▪ Physical activity</li><li>▪ Inadequate transportation funding</li><li>▪ Demographic characteristics:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Population</li><li>People of color</li><li>Household income</li><li>Transit trips</li><li>Walking Trips</li><li>Bicycle trips</li><li>Percentage of Children in neighborhood</li></ul></li></ul> <p>FACTORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Health care consolidation often results in facilities closures</li><li>▪ Supermarket chain consolidation often results in store closures</li><li>▪ Corner markets are perceived by residents as hubs for drug activity and</li></ul>

alcohol consumption.

- Not only is the food in smaller grocers often of poor nutritional quality, it is also often more expensive.
- In older areas such as Richmond and Oakland, the greatest need is for funding to maintain and enhance the parks that already exist. With many 40-50 year-old facilities, deferred maintenance is taking a heavy toll.
- The three counties have a tremendous bounty of regional parks. The East Bay Regional Park District, encompassing Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, has been purchasing and maintaining a fabulous assortment of parks that are meant to be used and accessed by East Bay residents, all of whom have paid for the parks through property taxes.

**Findings:**

- The Bay Area's most disadvantaged communities face significant transportation barriers to healthy activities. In low-income communities of color, where car-ownership rates are low, inadequate public transit limits access to hospitals, community clinics, supermarkets, and regional parks. People of color are disproportionately injured and killed on unsafe streets – a health crisis in itself that in turn contributes to fears of walking and bicycling.
- Only 28% of the residents of Alameda County's disadvantaged neighborhoods have transit access to a hospital, leaving over 160,000 residents without transit access.
- African-American pedestrians in Alameda County are 2.5 times more likely than white pedestrians to be hit by a car and killed or hospitalized.

- Percent of residents with transit access to a hospital:

Alameda County  
Central East Oakland 0%  
Elmhurst 7%  
Fruitvale 7%  
West Oakland 11%  
West Berkeley 26%  
San Antonio 80%

- Percent of residents with transit access to a clinic:

Central East Oakland 78%  
West Oakland 82%  
Elmhurst 83%  
Fruitvale 91%  
West Berkeley 94%  
San Antonio 99%

- Percent of residents with transit access to a grocery store:

Elmhurst 18%  
West Oakland 46%  
West Berkeley 50%  
San Antonio 60%  
Fruitvale 70%  
Central East Oakland 73%

- Regional parks are largely inaccessible to residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods. For residents of most neighborhoods, getting to a regional park is either impossible on transit or would require an extremely long ride. Few communities have a transit route that directly connects their neighborhood with a regional park, and if they do, it is likely to run every hour or less frequently.

**Recommendations:**

- Meet basic transit needs of low-income communities of color. First and foremost, we must begin by insuring that low-income communities of color have their basic transit needs met. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission recently identified a Lifeline Transit Network that would help meet many of the basic needs of low-income communities. This should be the top priority for funding, complemented by free transit passes for low-income families.
- Make health access a top priority in transportation policy and planning. Leaders from the transportation and health care communities need innovative collaborations that elevate health access issues on the transportation agenda. Some policy initiatives include identifying community clinics – not just hospitals – in the Lifeline Transit Network and requiring transit agencies to conduct a “Health Access Impact Analysis” of proposed route cuts and expansions. To promote healthful activity, funding for pedestrian and bicycle safety projects and for transit service to regional parks should be significantly increased.
- Make Medi-Cal transportation assistance available to all recipients. California should follow the example set in other states by expanding Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT) eligibility to include all people without access to a car – not just people with physical disabilities – and allow funds to be used for public transit.
- Direct public resources towards disadvantaged neighborhoods, without displacing existing residents.

We must reward cities that invest in transit-accessible services and facilities and expand programs, such as MTC’s Housing Incentive Program, that support transit-oriented affordable housing in these communities.

- Guard against reductions in transportation access to health care. Access depends on location. With a growing population, the health care industry should be opening new facilities, not closing or significantly reducing service at existing facilities that serve disadvantaged communities. We need to make public transit access a key consideration in any decision to close or significantly reduce service at a health care facility. Similarly, we must plan for high of transit access when considering the location of new facilities.
- Support innovative efforts to ensure food security in these neighborhoods.

Increasing access to healthy food must rely on a combination of efforts, including providing shopper shuttles to supermarkets, helping corner stores improve food quality and operation, and reinvesting in inner-city supermarkets.

**Mac Arthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 11: Social Cohesion and Social Exclusion (DRAFT)**

<b>Year Completed:</b>	2007
<b>Study Category:</b>	Youth and Families
<b>Produced By:</b>	UC Berkeley Health Impact Group
<b>Author(s):</b>	Kim Gilhuly
<b>Client/Reader:</b>	City decision-makers, City planning staff, Community organizations, Developers
<b>Geography:</b>	Mac Arthur BART Transit Village (MBTV) and surrounding neighborhood. Though the actual project is located east of the I-580 corridor, since the station is adjacent to neighborhoods west of I-580, these neighborhoods will be affected by impacted by design decisions for the MBTV.
<b>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</b>	This health impact assessment (HIA) identifies factors that contribute to a healthier, safer environment for the redevelopment of the Mac Arthur BART station area.
<b>Key Stakeholders:</b>	Community Members, Developers
<b>Methodology:</b>	Health Impact Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Data profiles the relative prevalence of nutrition related illness in the project area.</li><li>▪ Map area retail food resources</li><li>▪ Map existing retail establishments</li><li>▪ Assess area retail needs via maps and area interviews</li><li>▪ Research feasible interventions to improve area retail environment</li><li>▪ Review LSA retail study when complete</li><li>▪ Survey local residents on what kind of community center they would want/need and use</li></ul>
<b>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</b>	INDICATORS and VARIABLES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Community participation</li><li>▪ Trust</li><li>▪ Reciprocity</li><li>▪ Mutual cooperation</li><li>▪ Social networks (family, friends, peers, colleagues, etc.)</li><li>▪ Political engagement</li><li>▪ Leadership skills</li><li>▪ Optimism/Apathy</li><li>▪ Self Esteem</li><li>▪ Sense of control/Passivity</li><li>▪ Sense of belonging</li><li>▪ Social support</li></ul>

- Inclusion/alienation
- Self efficacy
- Stress
- Depression
- Housing adequacy
- Safety/security
- Secure livelihoods
- Access to health care
- Environmental quality
- Segregated neighborhoods
- Economic integration of neighborhoods
- Crime
- Jobs
- City services
- Opportunities for educational advancement
- Land use diversity
- Access to transit
- Walkability
- Chronic disease
- Poverty
- Informal social contact
- Economic opportunity mandates (e.g. prevailing wages)
- Household income
- Race

#### FACTORS

- Social Cohesion means a state in society in which the vast majority of citizens respect the law, one another's human rights and values, and share a commitment to retain social order. This impacts economic position and mobility, educational attainment, and living standards. Residential segregation is a key spatial indicator of social exclusion.
- Social capital is defined as the advantage created through relationships, formal, informal, and familial, with others.
- Social cohesion may affect health in three broad ways: (1) as a force to create and maintain shared norms for healthy behaviors; (2) by providing the ties to others that create security and give meaning to life; and (3) as a vehicle of collective problem solving and action to achieve material, political, and spiritual needs.

#### ***Findings:***

- Given the expected cost of the project's market rate housing and the current project area demographics, the project is likely to result in greater residential integration with regard to income at the level of the census tract.
- Indirectly, expected demographic changes can improve health of area residents via effects on retail environment and public infrastructure. Current area residents should share in many of those benefits.
- Market rate and below market rate housing will be segregated on the project site; project could further advance social integration by integrating BMR units.
- The incorporation of streets and sidewalks, retail and public areas within the project may facilitate interaction among project and neighborhood residents.

- The social integration of the East and West sides of the project area, historically socially segregated by the construction of the MacArthur BART and State Road (SR) 24 is a key goal both to community residents and BART, which, if achieved, would benefit health. Streetscape improvements to 40<sup>th</sup> Street between MLK and Telegraph will support reconnection but may not be adequate to achieve this outcome. A Westside entrance to BART would help achieve this goal if a feasible and safe method for such an entrance is available is found. Alternatively, developing Mac Arthur Blvd as a retail and pedestrian corridor might serve to help achieve this goal.
- The project itself will not directly displace area residents but, via desired economic and environmental effects, may ultimately result in higher property values and rents in the area. Potentially, project-stimulated economic effects may result indirectly in displacement of residents neighboring the MBTV, affecting social cohesion of the neighborhood.
- The project includes both new retail and new markets for retail. Local retail that addresses the needs of residents will encourage walking and social interaction from casual contact. Increasing local retail opportunities could also potential increase employment opportunities, thus economic integration.
- Public infrastructure and retail environment benefits will be disproportionately realized by east-side residents. Integrating plans for neighborhood serving retail on the West side could serve West-side economic revitalization and area-wide social cohesion.
- If the community's safety concerns regarding the MBTV (and ongoing concerns in the neighborhood) are properly addressed, increased perceived safety within the area could encourage people to interact outside of their homes.
- The 5,000 feet of community space currently included in the project can foster social interaction if programming providing it is designed in response to community needs.

***Recommendations:***

- Implement additional strategies to include more west side residents in the design and planning for MBTV.
- Integrate Below Market Rate and Market Rate housing on the project site.
- Create common walking routes and meeting points that encourage interaction.
- Facilitate economic development of MLK between 40th and MacArthur Blvd.
- Encourage locally-owned business development at the MBTV and on MLK.
- Solicit funding to hire a community program coordinator.
- Study MacArthur Boulevard as another Connector Project.
- Continue to study the feasibility of a Westside BART station entrance/tunnel with regard to safety, structural feasibility, and cost.
- Develop programs to retain low-income residential tenants vulnerable to displacement.
- Step up routine City maintenance of current infrastructure.

**Mac Arthur BART Transit Village Health Impact Assessment, Chapter 5: Schools and Child Care (DRAFT)**

<b>Year Completed:</b>	2007
<b>Study Category:</b>	Youth and Families
<b>Produced By:</b>	UC Berkeley Health Impact Group
<b>Author(s):</b>	Colleen Reid
<b>Client/Reader:</b>	City decision-makers, City planning staff, Community organizations, Developers
<b>Geography:</b>	Mac Arthur BART Transit Village (MBTV) and surrounding neighborhood. Though the actual project is located east of the I-580 corridor, since the station is adjacent to neighborhoods west of I-580, these neighborhoods will be affected by impacted by design decisions for the MBTV.
<b>Relevance to the purposes of the HOPE Collaborative</b>	This health impact assessment (HIA) identifies factors that contribute to a healthier, safer environment for the redevelopment of the Mac Arthur BART station area.
<b>Key Stakeholders:</b>	Community Members, Developers
<b>Methodology:</b>	Health Impact Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Data profiles the relative prevalence of nutrition related illness in the project area.</li><li>▪ Map area retail food resources</li><li>▪ Map existing retail establishments</li><li>▪ Assess area retail needs via maps and area interviews</li><li>▪ Research feasible interventions to improve area retail environment</li><li>▪ Review LSA retail study when complete</li><li>▪ Survey local residents on what kind of community center they would want/need and use</li></ul>
<b>Indicators, Variables, Factors:</b>	INDICATORS and VARIABLES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Small class size</li><li>▪ Locally accessible child care</li><li>▪ Vehicle miles traveled</li><li>▪ Walking and bike routes</li><li>▪ School enrollment</li><li>▪ School capacity</li><li>▪ Pedestrian injuries</li><li>▪ Neighborhood school access</li><li>▪ Neighborhood school quality</li><li>▪ Community cohesiveness (among students)</li><li>▪ Student learning</li><li>▪ Parent involvement</li></ul>

- Physical activity
- Environmental quality
- Obesity
- Traffic hazards
- Quality early childhood education

#### FACTORS

- The Transportation and Land Use Coalition (TALC) is initiating a *Safe Routes to Schools* program in Oakland starting with two schools in 2007. The program combines teaching basic safety to kids, contests and events to encourage children to walk to school, coordinating with local police to enforce traffic and safety laws near schools, and identifying safety hazards and working with the city to make improvements to streets for pedestrian safety. The two initial schools in the TALC program are Peralta Elementary and Berkeley Maynard Academy located 1.5 miles and 1.9 miles from MBTV.

#### **Findings**

- Using varying methods, estimates of student generation based on the proposed MBTV project's 80/20 mix of 625 market and below-market rate housing range from 132 to 420 new students. Although the local high school may have sufficient capacity for additional students from the transit village, local elementary and middle schools are near capacity and may not be able to support all new students from the transit village.
- A quantitative forecast of child care demand based on demographic data, suggests between 638 and 722 children will need the services of either family child care or a child care center, while only 172 and 373 spots are currently available in existing family child care and child care centers, respectively.
- Local schools are within 1.5 miles from MBTV, which allows for children to walk or bike to school. However, pedestrian hazards surrounding Mac Arthur BART (e.g. multi-lane roads, high vehicle volume) and limited safety countermeasures (e.g., advanced crosswalk design, bike paths) create a barrier to active transportation to schools.

#### **Recommendations**

- Re-assess the adequacy of school capacity in the neighborhood under the assumption that the project may ultimately attract families to the same degree as other transit villages
- Work with the Oakland Unified School District to ensure that local schools can meet project generated student demand
- Conduct further analysis of child care supply by age of child
- Ensure that there is a child care center at the Mac Arthur BART Transit Village with safe indoor or outdoor play space
- Investigate financial strategies for enabling or subsidizing child care on the site with Local Investment in Child Care (LINCC)
- Include at least two housing units in the village designed to function as family child care facilities
- Implement the City of Oakland Recommended Bikeway Network from 1999, especially the on-street striped bike lanes on 40th Street and Telegraph Ave
- Make pedestrian improvements on Telegraph Avenue to provide a safe crossing for children walking to local schools.

